

REMARKS

A new drawing sheet number 3 is forwarded herewith on which a new figure 6 is shown disclosing the prior art drawing figure previously indicated as view A. This complies with the drawing requirement made in the Office Action.

In the Office Action claims 1 and 5-7, were rejected as anticipated by U.S. 6,698,924 McCarthy, Jr. et al. and claims 1-4 were rejected as unpatentable over McCarthy, Jr. et al. Also, lack of antecedent basis for the term "the aspirator" in claim 3 was noted and claim 8 was allowed.

Claim 3 has been amended to correct the antecedent problem and claims 6 and 7 have been amended to remove the objectionable term "about" and, in claim 7, to replace the specific area designation with a smaller range. These changes are believed to overcome objections to the form of the claims.

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly distinguish over the McCarthy, Jr. et al. reference. As amended, claim 1 calls for "a cylindrical diffuser pipe extending from the outlet end of nozzle for connection with a pump inlet, the diffuser pipe defining a constant diameter passage having a cross-sectional area larger than that of the nozzle outlet end; and a head pipe connected to the diffuser pipe adjacent the outlet end of the nozzle and defining a head pipe passage, opening to the constant diameter diffuser pipe passage at the nozzle outlet end and adapted for connection with a source of coolant pressure head."

The cavitation suppressor as recited in claim 1 distinguishes from the prior art in that it includes a converging inlet nozzle, which opens at its inlet end directly into a cylindrical diffuser pipe having a constant larger diameter. This differs from the prior art of both McCarthy Jr. et al. and Figure 6, which both include venturi nozzles having a reducing diameter portion followed by an expanding diameter portion returning to an ultimate downstream pipe diameter. Claim 1 further distinguishes in that the head pipe passage opens to the constant diameter diffuser pipe passage at the nozzle outlet end.


Accordingly, reconsideration of the allowability of claim 1 as now amended is respectfully requested.

The distinguishing subject matter of claim 1, referred to above, is also included in a new claim 9, which is dependant upon the previously allowed claim 8. Allowance of claim 9 is also requested.

Claims 2-6 are also believed allowable based on the distinguishing subject matter of amended claim 1 on which claims 2-7 are dependant. Further, as to claims 6 and 7, the cross-sectional areas recited differ significantly from McCarthy Jr. et al., which, when determined by calculating the area of the straight pipe portion D13 divided by the area of the nozzle portion D10 results in an apparent area ratio of about 9.7. In any event, the differing structures of the interior configurations of the present invention and the prior art are believed to support the allowability of all claims presently in the application.

This amendment is believed to be fully responsive to the issues raised in the Office Action and to place this case in condition for allowance. Favorable action is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Robert J Outland, Attorney
Reg. No. 22,197
(313) 885-1500

enclosure